

**STM 1980:2**

**The works of Joseph Martin Kraus**  
**A preliminary overview of the sources**

*By Bertil van Boer Jr.*

© Denna text får ej mångfaldigas eller ytterligare publiceras utan tillstånd från författaren.

Upphovsrätten till de enskilda artiklarna ägs av resp. författare och Svenska samfundet för musikforskning. Enligt svensk lagstiftning är alla slags citat tillåtna inom ramen för en vetenskaplig eller kritisk framställning utan att upphovsrättsinnehavaren behöver tillfrågas. Det är också tillåtet att göra en kopia av enskilda artiklar för personligt bruk. Däremot är det inte tillåtet att kopiera hela databasen.

# The works of Joseph Martin Kraus

A preliminary overview of the sources\*

*By Bertil van Boer Jr.*

In September, 1980, the second symposium of the German-Swedish composer Joseph Martin Kraus was held in the small town of Buchen im Odenwald in West Germany, where the composer lived for many years during his youth. It was an important event in that it succeeded in showing the musicological world that there is growing interest in this highly imaginative man, and that Kraus can no longer be presented as an obscure Kapellmeister in the far north. Rather, he must be seen as an international figure whose manifold talents in both music and literature are to be recognized on their own merits as one of the achievements of that age.

However, the symposium ran afoul of some very basic problems: the lack of any comprehensive study of the sources, of an accurate discussion of his development as a composer as evidenced through a thorough analysis of his works, and of a complete reckoning of his musical and literary output. One example of this confusion that has heretofore existed in the source study may be seen in a lecture at the symposium by Helga Lühning, an Italian opera specialist. Frau Lühning attempted to give an overall picture of Kraus's works set to Italian texts, mostly by Metastasio. However, for one work, the small song/arietta *Ma tu tremi* from the secular cantata *La Tempesta* by Metastasio, it soon became evident that no one knew when it had been composed, for what purpose it was written, where the main sources were, or even what the original form of the work had been. It became apparent that some sort of solid foundation in the form of source study and thematic catalogue was needed as soon as possible, in order to rectify this sad state of affairs. I have attempted to answer part of this need in my research, the results of which will comprise two parts: the thematic catalogue and a basic study of the sources.

The catalogue will be a complete description of all of the composer's known works, laid out in such a manner as to facilitate an easily accessible overview of the source material and the composer's output. The source study will consist of a more detailed description of the autographs, copies, and early editions, with special consideration given to tracing the transmission of the works down to the present (or, unfortunately, down to the date of their loss or destruction) through secondary references. In addition, there will be two special chapters devoted to questions

\* This essay was originally delivered as a lecture before members of the Royal Swedish Academy of Music at the Academy on May 19, 1981. Abbreviations used:

S-Ub — Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek  
FSS — Fredrik Samuel Silverstolpe  
S-Kb — Kungliga biblioteket, Stockholm.

concerning chronology and authenticity. Of course, the study cannot hope to be exhaustive, and indeed many of the problems encountered so far will provide much material for future research. But it is my sincere desire that this work will provide a foundation for research into Kraus's life, music, and times. In this essay, I should like to present the overview of my research according to five categories: Autographs, Copies, Editions, Authenticity, and Chronology.

## Autographs

A discussion of a Kraus autograph covers two basic problems: first, what does an autograph look like, and second, can both the surviving and destroyed or lost autographs be traced after Kraus's death. A corollary to the first question concerns a more aesthetical problem: How did Kraus compose his music, and can the development of a work be traced through the autographs, both sketches and finished fair copies?

At present about 35 % of Kraus's music exists in autograph form, all of which is preserved, with one exception, in libraries in Stockholm and Uppsala. The one exception is a song *Poeter priser* which has recently turned up in the Silverstolpe collection at Näs herrgård in Rö, Uppland. These autographs may be divided into four basic categories: 1) Sketches; 2) *Partitürkonzepte*, that is, semi-scored drafts; 3) full scores and/or parts; and 4) transcriptions or second copies of full works. Examples of the first may be seen in the sketches now preserved bound into the backs of volumes containing complete scores as part of the Silverstolpe collection at the library of the University of Uppsala. These sketches comprise the rough drafts for parts of Act V of the opera *Aeneas i Cartago*, the cantata *Bland de hvita*, and the piano cantata *Fiskarstugan* (Example 1). Examples of the second exist in

Example 1. S-Ub Caps. 57: 3a, 52. Sketches to *Fiskarstugan*.



both Stockholm and Uppsala, and consist of a heretofore unknown motet for four voices and organ without text, the final chorus to a Prologue by D. G. Björn written for Duke Carl's (later Carl XIII) birthday in 1791 *Må Sveafolk*, a page from the now-lost aria for Poinset's play *Visittimman* (*Le Cercle*) *Hör mina ömma suckar klaga*, and the complete concept for the Overture in D Minor, containing the introduction later used by Kraus for the Funeral Cantata of Gustav III and a fugue from the overture to Albrechtsberger's oratorio *Die Pilger auf Golgatha* (1782). These second-category works generally show complete string orchestration and vocal line, but may be lacking texts and most or all winds.

The majority of the surviving autographs belong to the third and fourth groups, the complete autographs *erster Hand*. It is here that we may note the changes in Kraus's script during his life. In the foreword to his edition of the Symphony in C Minor, Richard Engländer remarked that the composer's handwriting was extremely variable, changing not only from manuscript to manuscript, but sometimes from line to line on a single page. However, my research has shown that this analysis of his handwriting style is perhaps a bit too hasty, for despite a general evolution in his script, as we shall see in the next two examples, and the idiosyncratic

Example 2. Autograph. Symphony in C Major, Mvt. II.



quirks induced by changing mood, emotional impairment and haste, the style remains remarkably constant. Example 2 shows his early handwriting. It is taken from a Symphony in C Major which may be dated to around 1778—1780. The care is evident, though the clefs are crude and the pen strokes large. In later years, more precisely after the beginning of his Grand Tour in 1782, the writing style becomes more spidery and succinct, as may be seen in Example 3. There exist local variations, such as the complete or incomplete curl on top of the treble clefs, but in reality, Kraus's style remains legible and almost unique. It evolves, but does not vary that much, and a combination of such factors as clefs, notes, stems, dynamics, rests, etc. gives an almost foolproof clue to his handwriting

Example 3. Autograph. Symphony in E flat Major, Mvt. III.



identity. Among the composers living in Sweden during Kraus's lifetime, only J. Wikmanson's script causes any difficulties in its similarity. As C.-G. Stellan Mörner noted in his dissertation on Wikmanson (Johan Wikmanson und die Brüder Silverstolpe, 1952), this pupil of Kraus in fact "completed" the last stanzas of the song *Dors mon enfant* in the Kraus *Liederbuch*, so carefully imitating his teacher's style that a separation of their contributions would be virtually impossible to distinguish were it not for a note by F. S. Silverstolpe testifying to the fact. But the normal Wikmanson manuscript during this time contains enough differences to make an identification possible.

Example 4. Autograph. J. Wikmanson, Motet from Näs herrgård.



The fourth category consists of works in autograph, but not in the original fair copy. That is to say, these are works for which Kraus himself wrote out copies for one reason or another. The best example of this is the above-mentioned Kraus *Liederbuch*, formerly in Wikmanson's possession and now in the Library of the Swedish Academy of Music. It comprises a collection of nearly all of Kraus's songs, gathered together by the composer for some as yet undetermined purpose (perhaps communal singing by the Palmstedt artistic circle). An example may be seen in the song *Der Abschied*, which, according to a letter by Kraus dated in March of 1785 in Paris, was sent to his dear friend Samuel Liedemann in Vienna as a special gift. However, it would appear that the song was transcribed, copied again, and eventually wound up in the *Liederbuch*, an autograph, but not the first autograph.

The transmission of the known autographs has been fairly easy to assess, even though many no longer survive (or have not yet been rediscovered). For example, Kraus willingly gave both Wikmanson and Haeffner autographs of his music. The latter had in his possession, at least for a time, the early opera *Azire*, since F. S. Silverstolpe borrowed the score from Haeffner's collection in 1808 for a run-through, according to Kraus's biographer. The Palmstedts were owners at one point of the complete Bellman—Kraus cantata cycle, which their heirs donated to the Royal Library in Stockholm in the middle of the 19th century. And too, there were many works that were burned in the tragic fire of the Dramatic Theater in 1827.

The German autographs are more interesting historically, even though none survive at present. It is known from both Kraus's own correspondence and the notes of F. S. Silverstolpe that the firm of Johann Traeg in Vienna possessed



several autographs, including the Concerto in C Major for violin and orchestra and the Sonata in D Minor for violin and cembalo. Much music from Kraus's early years was in the possession of his former teacher and leader of the Buchen *Kapelle*, Rector Georg Pfister, who later gave some of the autographs to Kraus's sister Marianne. The same may be said for Pater Roman Hoffstetter, who wrote to Silverstolpe on September 4, 1800:

All of these works were given to one of his sisters a few years ago, because she urgently begged for them, and because I had already decided at that time to abandon music due to my ever-present defect. In the meantime, however, I could not oppose my musical bent for long, and shortly began to sit down and play my fortepiano, and repent my all-too-hasty freewillingness.

Some of these autographs from Pfister were loaned to Silverstolpe in Vienna to aid in his collection, but have since disappeared. Catalogue cards from the *Landesbibliothek* in Darmstadt show that some of the Hoffstetter collection, notably a Duet for soprano, tenor and orchestra in G Major, was extant up to the Second World War. None of Kraus's student works from Mainz, Erfurt, or Göttingen have survived to the present. But some may have disappeared in 1779, when Kraus became the victim of a Dutch con man. In October of that year, he sold six pieces to a Dutch captain, who promised to pay him the following morning on board his vessel. When Kraus arrived at the duly appointed time, the ship was gone, and he was left without either music or money. "Unfortunately, the copy and original were one and the same", he lamented in a letter written shortly thereafter to his parents.

### Copies

The large majority of Kraus's works exist in copies. Both the numbers and the timespan of these copies are quite large, and it has been necessary to establish a certain order so that one may be able to distinguish between authentic copies (that is, copies known to have come directly from Kraus's own circle of friends, fellow composers, or professional copyists) and inauthentic copies (or, those which cannot be directly traced back to the composer).

By far the most important of the authentic copyists is Kraus's first biographer, the diplomat and amateur composer Fredrik Samuel Silverstolpe. C.-G. Stellan Mörner has postulated in his dissertation that Fredrik became acquainted with Kraus during the former's student years. This notion cannot be directly proven, for the evidence is sketchy at best. However, it is beyond dispute that Fredrik became a Kraus admirer *par excellence*. During his years as chargé d'affaires to the Austrian court from 1796 to 1802, Silverstolpe sought to gather as much information and music of Kraus's as he was able. He held lengthy correspondence with Kraus's family, especially his sister Marianne Lämmerhirt and his brother Alois, and friends such as Hoffstetter, gathered impressions from those famous composers who had known him, such as J. Georg Albrechtsberger and Joseph Haydn, and in general set himself out to be the chief promoter of the composer. With his brother Gustav Abraham, he persuaded Breitkopf & Härtel to publish some works, and he himself published a rather amateur arrangement for two keyboards of the overtures to *Aeneas* with

the Viennese firm of Johann Traeg. Most importantly, he copied, or had copied, as many of Kraus's works as he could get his hands on. Frau Lämmerhirt obligingly sent autographs of Kraus's music composed during his youth, and Silverstolpe actively sought out scores from Traeg and others. But his efforts did not stop in Vienna, for when he returned home to Stockholm in 1803, Silverstolpe enthusiastically searched out works and as late as 1835 was diligently copying out pieces for his collection, part of which he later donated to the library of the University of Uppsala, and part of which may be found at Näs herrgård.

Silverstolpe wrote with a firm, easily legible hand, as may be seen in Example 5. However, a change in handwriting style did occur about the year 1810. As may be seen in Example 5b, the simplified shape of the treble clef has given way to a more ornate shape, and the notes have become leaner, more spidery.

Example 5 a) J. M. Kraus, Finale to *Fintbergs bröllop*, F.S.S., 1804;

1. *Nr. 1.* *Fiskarstugan.* *Chor.*

*Andantino.* *mf* *I vår lilla fiskarstuga vi för dig, Camilla, en - ge glädjans*

*alla, så gör jag, på Camil las födels - dag!* *p.*

*Camilla.*

*Modérato.* *Mig naturens pryd förlinder, blicka svalkar, men och grön; morgon.*

*Tristis.* *rednan, val och ston, glidare mellan steg och stjärnor. Åk om svalkar, vid ditt*

*Largo. J. 1<sup>mo</sup>* *Den, midnattslimmans varma vinder, Mått hur jag den nyssna linder, mått hur lyckligt jag på en.*

In the introduction to his copy of *Proserpin* (now in the S-Ub), Silverstolpe tells us of the existence of two Viennese copyists he used. The first, whom I label Silverstolpe A, may be found on scores of Kraus works bearing dates from 1797—1800, and the second, Silverstolpe B, appears as the copyist of scores dated 1801—1802. A large majority of the church music is in Silverstolpe B's hand, corresponding roughly with the dates of Silverstolpe's correspondence with Kraus's family.

There is little doubt that Silverstolpe provided the future with a solid musicological foundation for Kraus research. In fact, many works owe their survival to Silverstolpe's copies, and a comparison between those works for which both the autograph and copy exist shows a remarkable degree of accuracy and faithful transcription. It may truly be said that although Silverstolpe did not copy all of Kraus's music, he did not copy music that was *not* by Kraus. In other words, he obtained copies of works which he was sure were authentic, and he tacitly ignored pieces with unsure or conflicting attributions. This alone assures us of the importance of his contribution to Kraus research.

The second most authentic copyist of Kraus' works was the contrabassist and director of the spectacles at the Royal Opera, Gottlieb Fredrick Ficker (1752—1840). The identification of this man's handwriting is based primarily upon

Silverstolpe, who makes many references to his "well-known script" and "easily identified hand". On the basis of Silverstolpe's notes, we learn that the score to *Aeneas* in the Opera Library is largely in Ficker's hand. Although Silverstolpe did not, in all likelihood, make a careful study of all six styles of handwriting to be found in that score, it is evident that one man, Ficker, did the lion's share of the copying, and that the same man was responsible for many other parts and scores found in the Opera Library. Thus his copies of Kraus's music become as authentic as possible, for in many instances in *Aeneas*, for example, there exist corrections by Kraus himself. Example 6 shows a sample of Ficker's style, always

Example 6. J. M. Kraus, *Aeneas*, Ballet Act V, Violin I (Ficker's hand).

*Nr. 5* *V. I.*

*Adagio*

*Allegretto*

*Adagio*

*Allegretto*

simple and clearly legible, and there is a remarkable degree of similarity to Silverstolpe's early writing style.

Of other copyists connected to Kraus, three composers must be mentioned: Wikmanson, J. C. F. Haeffner, and Pehr Frigel. The first has already been discussed. Haeffner, a German expatriate like Kraus, was director of the Royal Opera upon the latter's death and responsible for the first performance of Kraus's grand opera *Aeneas*. The authenticity of his copies of Kraus's music is vouchsafed through his close friendship with Kraus, his possession of Kraus autographs, and, in the

Example 7. Frigel's handstyle.

The image shows a handwritten musical score for the opera *L'Inca nell'Emorione di Metastasio* by Kraus. The score is written in a clear, legible handstyle. The title is written at the top, followed by the tempo marking *Adagio*. The score is for a full orchestra and includes parts for Corni, Oboe, Violini, Viola, and Fagotti. The score is written in a clear, legible handstyle. A circular library stamp is visible on the right side of the score.

case of a score to the opera *Proserpin* now in the Library of the Swedish Academy of Music, Kraus's personal corrections and stage directions on a score copied by Haeffner (on page 33). Pehr Frigel was a pupil of Kraus and secretary of the Academy. The large number of his copies in his readily identifiable hand (Example 7) show the extent to which Frigel was involved in preserving and performing Kraus's works. Frigel helped compile the account of Kraus's music that was eventually published in the *Amninnelsetal öfver Kraus* in 1798.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to go into the myriad of unauthentic copyists that I have found during this search. But I cannot close this section without mentioning one outside source (outside Sweden, that is) for Kraus's music. This is the stable of copyists employed by the firm of Johann Traeg in Vienna. We know that Kraus left some 10 works with Traeg for his copyhouse to sell. The fairly large spread of Kraus works in manuscript throughout central Europe, with present-day sources in Budapest, Vienna, Prague, Brno, Regensburg, Modena, and elsewhere, all show clearly the hand of Traeg's copyists.

### Editions

Very little of Kraus's music was published during his lifetime. Indeed, the entire list can be counted upon the fingers of both hands. But this circumstance did not come about for lack of trying on Kraus's part. To begin with, Kraus sought actively to have his music printed, and as early as December 27, 1777, we read in a letter to his brother Franz that a considerable list of "completed works" was available, "but if my brother will be patient awhile, then doubtless most of these will soon be in print". Unfortunately, few of this list of works have survived, as far as can be determined, certainly none in print. It is perhaps a bit ironic that Kraus, the man of letters, was able to publish (*Versuch von Schäfergedichten* 1773, *Tolon* 1776, *Etwas von und über Musik fürs Jahr 1777* 1778), while Kraus, the musician and composer, was not, at least until 1783. Kraus's first publication of his music came after contact was made with the publisher Hummel in Berlin in 1782, on the first leg of his Grand Tour. This first edition, the *Six Quatuors* dedicated to Gustav III, appears to have been published for two separate publics simultaneously. This is indicated by the appearance of the quartets with two title pages, one in French and one in Swedish, but with only one plate number. The former was done for wider appeal, and the latter language may represent Hummel's attempt to corner the Swedish market, such as it was. These works, the only ones to have been done by Hummel, were evidently quite popular, judging from the extensive sources for the prints even today.

The following year Kraus came into contact with the publishing firm of Johann Traeg in Vienna. The Traeg catalogues of 1799 and 1804, published by Alexander Weinmann in 1972, show that as many as 15 various works were to be had from the firm at one time, and Kraus's own list of letters shows extensive correspondence between himself and Traeg. But Traeg ran a cut-rate business, foregoing the more expensive engravings for a stable full of copyists, who could turn out copies more cheaply and rapidly than direct publication. Indeed, it may even be suggested that Traeg only gambled on printing a work when either the entire costs were

underwritten or when a large number of copies were sure to be sold. This would account for the frequency of works by popular favorites such as Dittersdorf and Haydn that one encounters in the catalogues. Only one piece by Kraus was ever engraved and published by Traeg; in 1799 the overtures to *Aeneas i Cartago* arranged for two keyboard instruments, and that only at the instigation of Silverstolpe, who in all likelihood subsidized part of the costs.

It was not until Kraus returned to Sweden in 1787 that his works began to be published by Olof Åhlström's Kungliga Privilegierade Not-Tryckeriet. The first two pieces were the two Fortepiano Sonatas in E Major and E-flat Major in 1788, followed in 1791 by a piano reduction for the intermèdes from *Amphitryon*, and the complete Funeral Music for Gustav III in 1792. However, many smaller pieces in piano reduction were offered as part of the periodical *Musikaliskt tidsfördrif* beginning in 1789. These included music from the operas *Soliman II* and *Äfventyraren*, a set of variations for fortepiano, and a host of songs. Selective printing of this sort continued well after Kraus's death, the last piece being a piano reduction of the concert duet *Si non ti moro allato* in 1823.

After Kraus's death, F. S. Silverstolpe and his brother Gustav Abraham contacted the Leipzig firm of Breitkopf & Härtel with the intention of publishing an *Œuvres complètes* of Kraus. Since the Silverstolpes had to subsidize the printings, it was intended at first to be a selective edition of works which they believed would have popular appeal. Other not so well-known works were to have followed, their costs to be paid by the successful ones. In 1796 they issued three volumes of the works simultaneously: the concert aria *Son pietosa* in score, the Symphony in C minor in parts, and a collection of 20 songs under the title *Airs et Chansons*. However, despite many favorable reviews in magazines such as the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* in 1800, sales were disappointing, and the Silverstolpes lost money. The result was that the scheme had to be abandoned after the first three works.

In 1799 Pleyel in Paris came out with the parts to the Flute Quintet, which he called Opus 7. This work had a moderate success, and one may note that it remained in the Pleyel catalogue for many years. Pleyel called the quintet "propriété de l'éditeur", which may indicate that the autograph of this work was in Pleyel's possession. We are certain that this piece was written for Kraus's friend, the musical amateur Samuel Liedemann. But how it came into Pleyel's possession is still a mystery that remains to be solved. It is possible that Pleyel obtained the autograph from Liedemann after the latter moved to Budapest shortly after 1787, or Pleyel's edition may represent a pirated copy of a Traeg score, for the work was on sale from Traeg in Vienna as early as 1787.

This is a brief overview of the sources of Kraus's music. It is time now to turn to a more tentative aspect of my study: how these sources affect the consideration of two important problems, the authenticity question and the creation of a reasonable chronology for the works.

### Authenticity

The question of authenticity is one of the largest problems concerning any

composer. The extensive appendixes in both the Köchel Mozart and Hoboken Haydn catalogues bear witness to the large number of questionable sources and attributions. Kraus research is also faced with this problem, though to a lesser extent. The name Kraus is a fairly common one in the Germanic countries. While Gerber's *Musikalisches Lexikon der Tonkünstler* of 1817 lists only two composers with that last name, Eitner lists no less than seven who were active during the last half of the 18th century. When one takes into account the irregular orthography of that era, where the name Kraus could be spelled with two final s's at the end (or an ß), or as Krause, or even Krautz, then the overall total climbs to well over 15 names.

Among the works of our Kraus, that is, the Swedish *Kapellmeister* Joseph Martin, this problem is not as large as with, say, Mozart. First, as we have seen, Kraus was not extensively published during his lifetime, and his music did not have a wide circulation. Second, our present state of research shows that there exist large gaps in the known output. This means that a great deal of further research is necessary in this realm to fill in these lacunae and to establish a concrete picture of Kraus's musical style before looking more closely into alternative attributions. Nonetheless, several of these types of problems have had to be dealt with in my study, based for the most part on the meager evidence at hand.

Basically, the authenticity question falls into three categories: those works which are by Kraus, but which have been attributed to Mozart, Haydn, etc.; those works which appear to be by Kraus, but which have been altered or reworked in such a way that their original form is not immediately clear from the sources; and, those works which have been attributed to Kraus, but which are doubtful due to stylistic considerations and/or spurious attributions.

Within the first group, some four works have been discovered: the song *Schlaf, süsßer Knabe*, the *Miserere* in C Minor, the *Te Deum* finale, and the Symphony in D Major. The first two are attributed to Mozart, the third to Pergolesi, and the last to Joseph Haydn. The song *Schlaf, süsßer Knabe* is first attributed to Mozart in the magazine *Cäcilia* in 1846, where the notes appended to the music tell us that Mozart composed it as a cradle song for his son Karl. Fortunately, the song's appearance in the autograph Kraus *Liederbuch* and in the collection *Airs et Chansons* (1796) confirms the true author of the piece. This, by the way, is duly noted in the latest edition of the Köchel catalogue. The *Miserere*, in contrast, is not attributed to Kraus in the Köchel catalogue, though a note states that "it is without believability both internally and externally, and known only from a single source". A comparison between this work, now in Berlin at the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz (Mus. ms. 15 102), and the Kraus *Miserere* from the Silverstolpe collection at the Uppsala University Library (Caps. 57: 3a, 2) shows the true author. The two manuscripts are almost identical, and furthermore, the handwriting of the Berlin copy has been determined to be that of J. C. F. Haeffner. An article about this discovery appeared in the September 1981 issue of the Mozarteum's *Mitteilungen*. The case of the Pergolesi misattribution appears to stem from switched coverboards at the Opera Library in Stockholm, and the Haydn attribution is disputed by a Silverstolpe comment on the back of the



autograph to a Symphony in C Major which gives the tragic history of the symphony (burned in the Dramatic Theater fire of 1827) along with its themes.

The second group of works comprises four pieces, all vocal music: the Cantata-Mass in E Minor, a motet *Förkunnom högt*, and two songs *Du välgörare och far* and *Dröj sol uti din uppgångstimma*. The first is mentioned in a letter from Kraus's sister Marianne to Silverstolpe dated May 28, 1801, in which she states that the oratorio *Die Geburt Jesu* was hacked to bits and incorporated into a "Mass" by the leader of the Buchen Kapelle Rector Georg Pfister. Stylistically the Mass in E Minor shows little resemblance to other Kraus works of this period. For instance, the Mass revolves around the key of D Major, not E Minor. But the internal structure of the work shows that the individual sections have little tonal relationship to each other: the Kyrie is in E Minor, the Gloria and Sanctus in D Major, the Credo in C Major, and the Agnus Dei in B Minor. The Dona nobis section of the Agnus sounds like a bad 3/8 waltz and the text has been obviously shoehorned into preextant vocal lines. The Incarnatus, with a long, involved solo violin and organ part, is absolutely unplayable. There is some real Kraus in all of this mess, but where is not easy to determine. The motet *Förkunnom högt*'s sole source is a collection of sacred pieces bound together in a book in the S-Kb. It was compiled about the year 1810. The work is for solo voice, chorus, and organ, but the orchestral style accompaniment, with sprawling chords and trumpet fanfares, would appear to indicate that the organ part represents a keyboard reduction. Since the collection also contains sections of the Funeral Cantata with contrafacture texts, it may be that our motet represents a reworking of another work. Indeed, the resemblance of the first theme of the motet to the fiery aria *Gå Pluto gå* from the opera *Proserpin* is remarkable. The authenticity of the two songs is vouchsafed by Silverstolpe, who includes them in a book entitled *Songs in translation* (S-Ub Caps. 57: 3a, 53). Since the rest of the songs in this collection are translated from German originals, it may well be that these two works were originally German too, with texts that may have read *Du unser Wohltäter und Vater* and *Verweiche Sonne, dein' Aufgangsstunde*. This, of course, is pure speculation, and will need much more research.

The third group, consisting of works attributed to Kraus, but of doubtful authorship, contains eight pieces. As an example of the problems associated with this group, I would like to take a close look at one of these works, the Sonata for guitar and violin, Schreiber Verzeichnis H/1. It is rewarding when one is able to trace a misappellation back to its source. Such an occurrence happens with the Sonata in G Major for violin and guitar Opus 1, which Schreiber lists as formerly in the library of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna, but now lost. Schreiber's attribution stems directly from Eitner, who for some reason calls the work a Sonata for guitar and piano. A thorough search for this work has revealed some interesting facts. First, the edition has not been lost, and may be found at present in the library of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna (Mus. ms. X. 4654). Second, Eitner apparently misread the title page of the work in his designation of instrumentation and attribution, and did not check his findings out with earlier lexica such as Gerber. The titlepage of the sonata reads

correctly *Sonate/ pour la/ Guitarre et Violon/ composée/ par/ J. Kraus/ Op: 1 — Pr. 10 Gr./ À Leipzig/ chez A. Kühnel./ (Bureau de Musique)*. The composer's name, J. Kraus, is not a foolproof attribution to Joseph Martin Kraus, and indeed Gerber shows that a certain J. Kraus, musician at the court of Bernburg, published three works during the decade 1790—1800: Opus 1, a Sonata for guitar and violin; Opus 2, a Sonata for solo guitar in C Major; and Opus 3, Variations for guitar and voice on the theme *An die Mädchen*. All three appeared with the publishing house of A. Kühnel in Leipzig, and the last was republished in Braunschweig (attributed on the title page to "Kraus"). We have, then, identified the correct composer for the Sonata for guitar and violin. But what happened to his entry between its appearance in the Gerber and Eitner lexica? For the answer to this question one must look under the rubric "V. Kraus" in Eitner (and Fétis), and there one can find all of the information recorded by Gerber under J. Kraus. But why the "V" was substituted for the "J", and who did the substituting remains a mystery. The truth is, we know, that Kraus's first published works were the six quartets dedicated to Gustav III, done in Berlin by Hummel in 1783, the entire set duly listed as Opus 1. The sonata by J. Kraus has no real connection to our Kraus, either from the sources or from a stylistic standpoint.

### Chronology

An accurate chronological order for Kraus's works is at present very tentative. Fewer than 10 % of any of the autographs or authentic copies contain a date by Kraus himself, and those that do are sometimes limited to the year of composition. For example, the autograph of the concert duet *Si non ti moro allato*, now at the Uppsala University Library, is dated by Kraus May 8, 1787. On the other hand, the autograph score of the opera *Soliman II*, now in the Opera Library, merely says 1788. If Kraus himself cannot provide the necessary dates, then other avenues must be found, including dates by authentic copyists such as Silverstolpe, mention of the first performances of specific works in secondary sources such as correspondence and newspaper reviews, and mention of pieces in Kraus's own extensive correspondence. In addition, one may attempt to provide a tentative timespan for a work through modern methods such as musical analysis, handwriting analysis, and watermark and ink research. But the majority of the works cannot be dated any more specifically than a certain *Entstehungszeit*.

Kraus's personal letters are notorious for not mentioning anything about his compositional activities. To be sure, there are occasions when he steps out of character to provide us with a list of works, such as the "completed works" in a letter dated December 28, 1777, or indications for *Amphitryon* in one dated July 32 (!), 1784. But on the whole, he is extremely lax about describing what he is doing, which makes a tremendous contrast to the detailed descriptions of Mozart's letters, for instance. An example may be seen in *Aeneas*, which appears in Kraus's letters only at its inception in 1782. Nothing specifically is heard about the opera after the abortive attempt at performance at the dedication of the new Opera House in 1782, even though its composition occupied him for the next nine years. Kraus's more successful stage work, the opera *Soliman II*, is not mentioned at

all. Neither are the majority of his works for the stage. That is not to say that Kraus's letters are dull and unimaginative. Quite the contrary. They are full of witty and perceptive observations of his society, politics, philosophy, and acquaintances—but very little music.

Newspaper announcements and reviews are equally frustrating. For example, an issue of the *Dagligt Allehanda* in February 1780 states that an aria by Kraus was sung by Fru Augusti and that it had a wonderful impact upon the public. Questions concerning what type of aria, in what key, for what orchestration, and for what occasion remain tantalizingly just out of reach. Only the sales announcements give any real information. But in the case of the two piano sonatas published in 1788 by Åhlström, at least one of the works, the Sonata in E-flat Major, dates from at least three years earlier.

Silverstolpe did a remarkable job in dating many of his copies with *both* the date of composition (when known) and the date that he copied the works. While there appears no reason to doubt the latter, the former must be subjected to scrutiny. For example, in perhaps the only case where we have both a dated autograph and Silverstolpe's copy, the cantata *La Primavera* is dated by Kraus 1790, but by Silverstolpe 1789. But it is clear that Silverstolpe has spared little effort in tracking down as much information as he could, and his dates, though they must be tested, are probably more accurate than nothing.

This leaves the modern methods of dating. As an example of the dangers that await the researcher attempting to base his arguments on stylistic considerations, I would like to present two cases, the incidental music to the play *Olympie* and the songs in the Kraus *Liederbuch*. The first contains the violent tonal changes, the sparse instrumentation, and the characteristic *Sturm und Drang* motifs associated with Kraus's early Stockholm period. Richard Engländer, confronted with the fact that Kellgren's play was not produced until 1790, cautiously stated that although it may have been produced at that late date, the music could have been written earlier. Friedrich Riedel has adhered to this view, basing his arguments on the fact that the music has only two horns, instead of the four that appear in other late works such as the *Sinfonia da chiesa*, the Funeral Music, and the opera *Aeneas*. But from the standpoint of style, it is impossible to prove that Kraus could *not* have written such a work in 1790 without using earlier material. Certainly there exists a tremendous amount of emotionally charged music in the choruses to Adlerbeth's play *Oedipe*, composed in 1791 (which, by the way, only uses two horns). The available evidence in the form of announcements for the premiere of the work in the *Stockholm Posten* in 1790 and the usual habit of 18th-century composers to compose for specific occasions would appear to be in favor of the later date.

The same problem appears in the Kraus *Liederbuch*. In this collection, gathered by Kraus himself about 1788–1789, some of the works are dated by the composer in the following manner: "Der Abschied V: d: X/VIIIC,, (= V[ien] d[en] 27 Oktober 1783). Volker Bungardt, in his dissertation on the *Lieder*, completely discounted these dates on the basis of stylistic criteria and the lack of every song in the *Liederbuch* to contain such chronological remarks. However, it must be under-

stood that this book was compiled from existing single manuscripts, and it is entirely possible, given Kraus's usual lackadaisical approach to dating, that some of these individual autographs did not contain dates. Evidence for this view may be seen in the two-leaf autograph for the song *Ynglingarne*, now in the Library of the Swedish Academy of Music. This autograph *erster Hand* is not dated, and neither is its counterpart in the *Liederbuch*. I see no reason to doubt Kraus's own dates on his songs in the book, nor do I see any reason for Bungardt's stylistic criteria as *prima facie* evidence against the composer's own dating.

Unfortunately, the more modern methods such as watermark research have been hampered by restrictions on time and funds. Watermark dating is only valid, whatever method is used to gather the watermarks, if the necessary preliminary research has been done beforehand. In the case of Swedish watermarks, much more work needs to be done before it can be applied to Kraus research. But I have begun some preliminary work in this area, the results of which are tentative, and subject to much revision. I have attempted a comparative study, which means that I have taken samples of watermarks from manuscripts dated by Kraus and compared them to catalogues and other not-dated manuscripts. This attempt has been made with the not entirely inaccurate assumption that Kraus's heavy compositional duties required a great deal of paper, and that supplies were constantly changing. However, as I have stressed before, a great deal of caution is required, and my results are so rudimentary at this point that I hesitate to include them here. The lion's share of research in chronology clearly remains to be done.

\*

Thus we have a very brief overview of my research on Kraus to date. As is common with this sort of beginning, many new paths for future research have emerged, and many nagging problems remain to be solved. There is the great possibility that undiscovered autographs exist today in small private collections in continental Europe and that many heretofore unknown works by Kraus will be found. It is hoped that with this beginning study, the avenues of exploration will be followed which will result in Kraus being recognized as one of the musical geniuses of his age.